

60,427-619; 2004P02737US

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 and 19-26 remain pending in the application including independent claims 1, 7, and 26.

Claims 1-12 and 19-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by any one of Bassi (US 4386949), Mailey (US 5333965), or Hill (5628533). Each of these rejections will be addressed in turn below.

Claim 1 requires a molded component including a base portion defining a bottom surface with an attachment member that is integrally formed as one piece with the base portion, where the attachment member includes a cylindrical body portion extending out from the bottom surface to a distal end having a retention member with a plurality of flanges spaced apart from one another that extend out radially from the cylindrical body portion. None of the recited references disclose this combination of features.

Bassi discloses a sleeve 1 with a bottom wall 2 and a cross wall 3 with a slot 4 that receives a shank 30. A cap 5 includes a boss 6 that mates with cross wall 3. The boss 6 includes a slot 7 that aligns with slot 4 in the cross wall 3. The cap 5 includes two grooves 8, 9 and two flat surfaces 10, 11 that extend between an edge of a respective one of the grooves 8, 9 and the slot 7.

The examiner argues that Bassi discloses a sleeve 1 projecting from a bottom wall 2 and an attachment member with a cylindrical body portion 31. The examiner further argues that this attachment member 31 has a retention member 11 with a plurality of flanges 7-10. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this interpretation of Bassi.

60,427-619; 2004P02737US

The sleeve 1, 2, which the examiner argues corresponds to the claimed base portion is not formed as one piece with the attachment member 31. This is clearly shown in Figure 2, which shows that attachment member 31 and sleeve 1, 2 are separate components. Further, the attachment member 31 in Bassi does not include a cylindrical body portion that extends from the bottom surface of sleeve 1, 2 to a distal end having a retention member. Again, the cap 5, which the examiner argues corresponds to the claimed retention member, is not part of the attachment member 31, which is defined in the claims as being formed as one piece with the base portion. Finally, Bassi does not include a plurality of flanges spaced apart from one another that extend out radially from the cylindrical body portion of the attachment member 31. The flanges 7-10, which the examiner argues corresponds to the claimed flanges, are not formed as part of the attachment member 31 and are not even flanges as defined in the claims.

Thus, for the many reasons set forth above, Bassi does not disclose the features set forth in claim 1. For similar reasons, Bassi does not anticipate claims 2-12 and 19-26.

The Mailey and Hill references also do not disclose the features of claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 requires that the attachment member have a cylindrical body portion that extends to a distal end having a retention member with a plurality of flanges spaced apart from one another, where the flanges extend out radially from the cylindrical body portion.

Mailey discloses a locking member 20, support guide 22, and anvil 24. The anvil 24 includes a plunger portion 25. The examiner argues that plunger portion 25 corresponds to the claimed attachment member 25, however, component 25 in Mailey clearly does not have a cylindrical body portion. Further, component 25 does not extend to a distal end that has a

60,427-619; 2004P02737US

retention member with a plurality of flanges. Finally, the retention members in Mailey clearly do not have an arcuate surface as defined in the claims.

Hill also does not disclose an attachment member with a cylindrical shape. Hill discloses a flattened latch 40 with a neck portion 42, a head portion 44, and wings 46a, 46b. The wings 46a, 46b lie in a plane that is parallel to the neck portion 42. The wings 46a, 46b have straight, flat outer edges 47.

The examiner argues that Hill discloses a body portion 42 with a retention member 44 with a plurality of flanges 47. Figure 1 clearly shows that the latch 40 does not have a cylindrical body member. As discussed above, Hill discloses a latch 40 with a flat, planar body shape. Further, the latch 40, as shown in Figure 1, does not have retention members with arcuate surfaces as defined in the claims.

The examiner admits that Mailey and Hill do not disclose an attachment member having a cylindrical shape. The examiner also admits that these references do not disclose flanges having an arcuate surface. However, the examiner argues that mere changes in shape without affecting the function of the part would have been an obvious design modification. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Neither Mailey nor Hill disclose applicant's unique configuration as set forth in the claims. Applicant's claimed configuration provides beneficial features that are not disclosed in the prior art. As described at paragraph [21] of the subject application:

The cylindrical body portion 22 defines a center 32 with the flanges 28 extending out radially away from the center 32. Each of the flanges 28 has a base 34 that extends out to a tip 36. Preferably, the flanges 28 are narrower at the base 34 than at the tip 36. The tips 36 preferably form an arcuate surface 38. The arcuate

60,427-619; 2004P02737US


surface 38 facilitates push in force and helps accommodate for any mis-alignments between mating components.

Thus, as neither Mailey nor Hill disclose the features set forth in claim 1, neither Mailey nor Hill can anticipate claim 1. For similar reasons Mailey and Hill do not anticipate the remaining claims.

Also, please note that the examiner has not identified where in the references the features of the dependent claims are shown. If the examiner continues to sustain anticipation rejections based on Bassi, Mailey, or Hill, applicant requests that the examiner provide arguments indicating where the features of claims 2-11 and 19-26 are disclosed.

Applicant asserts that all claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests an indication of such. It is believed that no additional fees are due, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482, in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds, for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,


  
Kerrie A. Laba, Reg. No. 42,777  
Carlson, Gaskey & Olds  
400 W. Maple Road, Ste. 350  
Birmingham, MI 48009  
(248) 988-8360

Dated: August 19, 2005

60,427-619; 2004P02737US

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States patent and Trademark Office, fax number (571) 273-8300, on August 19, 2005.

  
Laura Combs